

Remarks

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the undersigned during the telephone interview. An interview summary accompanies this response.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-9, and 11-23 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) for anticipation over U.S. Patent No. 6,333,790 to Kageyama. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) for obviousness over Kageyama in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,089 to Austin et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request allowance of all pending claims.

Referring to claim 1, the Examiner and the undersigned discussed limitations of the claimed image forming device with respect to the prior art during the interview. It was indicated to the undersigned by the Examiner that the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest disablement of the dynamic application. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable inasmuch as the prior art fails to disclose or suggest *disablement of the dynamic application after the operation is performed* as recited in claim 1. Further, on page 2 of the Action, it is stated that spool control part 2130 allegedly discloses the claimed dynamic application. As discussed during the interview, Kageyama is void of any teachings regarding communication of the spool control part 2130 externally of the image forming device or any other teachings which may be fairly considered to disclose or suggest the claimed *input/output interface configured to communicate the dynamic application externally of the image forming device*. Further, the prior art is void of any disclosure or suggestion of disablement of the spool control part 2130 as defined in claim 1. Any modification of Kageyama to disable the spool control part 2130 is non-sensical inasmuch as an inoperative device would result. Positively-recited limitations of claim 1 are not disclosed nor suggested by the prior art and claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason.

The claims which depend from independent claim 1 are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claim as well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

Serial No. 09/639,450
Case No. 10992574-1
Amendment B

Referring to claim 12, the image forming method recites communicating a dynamic application relative to the image forming device, the dynamic application comprises plural executable instructions configured to cause the processor to perform an operation, and disabling the dynamic application. The prior art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed communicating or disabling and claim 12 is allowable for at least this reason.

The claims which depend from independent claim 12 are in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claim as well as for their own respective features which are neither shown nor suggested by the cited art.

Referring to claim 20, the image forming method recites receiving a dynamic application within the image forming device, the dynamic application includes plural executable instructions configured to cause the processor to perform an operation, and disabling the dynamic application. The prior art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed receiving or disabling and claim 20 is allowable for at least this reason.

Applicants request allowance of all pending claims.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours (Pacific Time Zone).

Respectfully submitted,
Cooper Urle et al.

By


James D. Shaurette

Reg. No. 39,833

Date: 3/28/05

(509) 624-4276

Serial No. 09/639,450
Case No. 10992574-1
Amendment B